

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TROY CECSARINI,

Defendant.

CASE No. 2:22-cr-00184-TL

ORDER ON MOTION TO MODIFY
CONDITIONS OF RELEASE

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Troy Cecsarini's Motion to Modify Conditions. Dkt. No. 59. Having reviewed the motion, the Government's response (Dkt. No. 60), and the relevant record, the Court DENIES the motion.

On November 14, 2024, the Court sentenced Mr. Cecsarini to five years' probation and imposed six special conditions, one of which requires him to participate in the location monitoring program for a period of 180 days. Dkt. No. 51. The location monitoring special condition will be completed on May 13, 2025.

1 Mr. Cesarini requests the condition be terminated early to “enable [him] to obtain full-
2 time employment.” Dkt. No. 59-1 at 2. He says that he is willing to provide “any necessary
3 documentation regarding [his] job applications, work schedule and anything else that would
4 allow these changes.” *Id.* The Government agrees with the Probation Office’s assessment that no
5 changes are warranted at this time, as Mr. Cesarini has not provided specifics about his job
6 search to the Probation Officer or the Court. Dkt. No. 60 at 1–2. The Government also notes that
7 the Probation Office has previously approved pass requests for employment-related activities. *Id.*
8 at 2.

9 In sentencing Mr. Cesarini to a term of probation and rejecting the Government’s
10 recommendation of a sentence of imprisonment of 18 months followed by three years of
11 supervised release, the Court informed him that it was giving him a break due to his success
12 while on pretrial supervision. Neither the location monitoring program nor any of the other
13 conditions of Mr. Cesarini’s probation are onerous, especially in comparison to a term of
14 imprisonment. The only reason that the Probation Office has not approved Mr. Cesarini’s
15 requests for leave for employment-related purposes is the lack of specific information provided.
16 *See generally* Dkt. No. 60-1. The Court encourages Mr. Cesarini to supply probation with more
17 details as requested by the Probation Officer when seeking permission to leave his residence so
18 that probation can fully and adequately assess his requests. If Mr. Cesarini provides the
19 Probation Officer with “any necessary documentation regarding [his] job applications, work
20 schedule and anything else that would allow these changes,” as Mr. Cesarini indicates he is able
21 to (Dkt. No. 59-1 at 2), his leave requests should be approved without the Court needing to
22 change the special condition which also expires in approximately one month.

23 //

24 //

1 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Mr. Cesarin's motion.
2
3

4 Dated this 7th day of April 2025.
5
6

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

16 
17 _____
18 Tana Lin
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24